



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,417	09/25/2003	Wilson Wai Sing Leung	402811	5061
23548 7590 01/06/2011 LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD 700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960				
EXAMINER CZEKAJ, DAVID J				
ART UNIT 2483		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 01/06/2011		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCpatent@leydig.com
Chgpatent@leydig.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,417

Applicant(s)

LEUNG, WILSON WAI SING

Examiner

DAVID CZEKAJ

Art Unit

2483

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishi et al. (2003/0155479), (hereinafter referred to as "Kishi") in view of Edwards et al. (6946988), (hereinafter referred to as "Edwards") in further view of Benthin et al. (20020013138), (hereinafter referred to as "Benthin").

Regarding claim 1, Kishi discloses an apparatus that relates to an automotive electronic device (Kishi: paragraph 0002). This apparatus comprises "a chassis including a front side having a bottom part" (Kishi: figure 3), "a playing mechanism provided in the chassis" (Kishi: figure 3, wherein the playing mechanism is the cd player), and "a control panel provided on the chassis front side for operating the playing mechanism, the control panel having a bottom part hinged to that of the chassis front side such that a top part of the panel is pivotable from an upward position wherein the control panel lies flat on the

chassis front side forward away from the chassis to a downward position extending therefrom for operation" (Kishi: figure 3; paragraph 0038, wherein the panel is pivoted away from the chassis to a downward position). However, this apparatus lacks the wireless link and single transmitter/receiver as claimed. Edwards teaches that there is a need in the prior art to provide a remote control function without providing two different interface sets (Edwards: column 1, lines 50-54). To help alleviate this apparatus, Edwards discloses "a wireless link between the control panel and playing mechanism such that the playing mechanism is operable by the control panel when the panel is detached, acting as a remote control" (Edwards: figures 1-2; column 4, lines 13-23, wherein the control panel is the remote control), "the control panel is removable from the chassis (Edwards: figures 1-2), and "the wireless link is provided by a transmitter and receiver" (Edwards: column 4, lines 24-39, wherein the single transceiver 57 provides the wireless link). Benthin teaches the use of a single transmitter/receiver (Benthin: paragraphs 0020-0023). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Kishi, add the link disclosed by Edwards, and replace the multiple transmitters/receivers in Edwards with the single transmitter/receiver in Benthin in order to obtain an apparatus that integrates a remote device within a single interface. One would further be motivated to reduce the cost/size of the device since only a single transmitter/receiver would be used.

Regarding claim 2, Kishi discloses "the panel has a first side adjacent the chassis front side on which a plurality of control keys are provided for operating the playing mechanism" (Kishi: figure 3).

Regarding claim 3, Kishi discloses "the panel includes a second side opposite the first side, the second side being substantially blank" (Kishi: figure 2).

Regarding claim 4, Kishi discloses "each bottom part of the chassis front and the panel has left and right corners adjacent those of the other bottom part, and the adjacent corners of each pairs are releasably hinged together" (Kishi: figures 2-4; paragraph 0025).

Regarding claim 5, Kishi discloses "a releasable catch is provided between the chassis front and control panel for holding the panel in the upward position" (Kishi: figures 4-5).

Regarding claim 6, Kishi discloses "the control panel dips at an acute angle in the downward position" (Kishi: figures 3 and 9-10).

Regarding claim 7, Kishi discloses "the panel has generally the same shape and size as the front and in the upward position covers substantially the entire chassis front side" (Kishi: figure 3).

Regarding claim 8, Edwards discloses "wherein the wireless link comprises an infrared link" (Edwards: column 3, lines 40-45).

Regarding claim 9, Kishi in view of Edwards disclose "the wireless link is provided by a pair of transmitter and receiver located at the panel and the

chassis front side at positions generally aligned with each other" (Kishi: figures 3-6; Edwards: figure 4; column 3, lines 40-45).

Regarding claim 10, Kishi in view of Edwards disclose "the panel is hinged to the chassis for pivotal movement about a horizontal hinge axis and the transmitter and receiver are located adjacent the hinge" (Kishi: figures 3 and 9-10; Edwards: figure 4, column 3, lines 40-45).

Regarding claim 11 Edwards discloses "locate the transmitter and receiver at central locations" (Edwards: figures 4-5, wherein the transmitter and receiver are located at central locations).

Regarding claim 12, Edwards discloses "the transmitter and receiver are located at the same corners of the control panel and chassis front side" (Edwards: figures 1-2).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2483

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID CZEKAJ whose telephone number is (571)272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joe Ustaris can be reached on (571) 272-7383. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dave Czekaj/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2483